

**REMARKS**

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 7 and 11 are the independent claims.

Claims 1, 4, 7, and 11 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-15 stand under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,644,325 (King) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,809,366 (Yamakawa et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, inter alia, selecting an R, a G, or a B component of an R,G,B signal including a video signal as a selected R,G,B signal.

Independent claim 4 recites, inter alia, a minimum value detector detecting a minimum pixel level value in a particular region of a selected R,G,B signal input from a signal inputting unit, the selected R,G,B signal being an R, a G, or a B component of a received R,G,B signal.

Independent claim 7 recites, inter alia, detecting a minimum pixel level value of an R,G,B, signal selected from received R,G,B signals, the selected R,G,B, signal being an R, a G, or a B component of the received R,G,B signals.

Independent claim 11 recites, inter alia, an abnormal state detector detecting an abnormal video signal in an R,G,B signal selected from among received R,G,B signals based on a comparison of a detected pixel level value in a portion of the R,G,B signal and a predetermined value, the selected R,G,B signal being an R, a G, or a B component of the received R,G,B signals.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that neither King et al. nor Yamakawa et al. teaches or suggests at least the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11. Thus, while not conceding the propriety of the asserted combination, the asserted combination is likewise deficient.

In rejecting independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11, the Office Action relied on King, contending that King teaches or suggests the feature of “selecting an R,G,B signal including video signal and setting a region of the selected R,G,B signal to be checked” as previously recited in independent claim 1. Without conceding the propriety of this contention, it is

respectfully submitted that King does not teach or suggest the aforementioned features of amended independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11. Indeed, the portions of King relied upon by the Office Action at best refer generally to using RGB data to control amplification of signals. (See, e.g., Col. 5, lines 38-40). Absent from King is any teaching or suggestion of selecting a component of an R,G,B, signal as recited in the independent claims.

The secondary citation to Yamakawa et al. relates to a method and system for calibrating a color copier and is cited for its alleged teaching of detecting a minimum pixel value. In particular, for example, absent from Yamakawa et al. is any teaching or suggestion of selecting a component of an R,G,B, signal. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Yamakawa et al. does not add anything to the teachings or suggestions of King et al. that would remedy the aforementioned deficiency.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 28, 2006

By:   
Michael E. Kondoudis  
Registration No. 42,758

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501